



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ἰλόιρ δο Ὀθια ἀν ῥνα ἡάρουιθ, ἀγυρ ρίοδῶάν αιρ αν ὀταλῖν δεαῖτοιλ δο να δάοιμιθ.

LUKE ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 28.

APRIL, 1854.

**{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Vulgate	43
On the Constrained Celibacy of the Clergy—Dialogue IV.	44
The Old Irish Clergy—No. III. (continued from page 35)	45
How far is the Reformation affected by the characters and motives of the Reformers?	45
Results of Intolerance in France—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes	46
The Index Expurgatorius	48
Talk of the Road—No. XXIII. (The Glories of Joseph.)	49
Toleration and Unity	49
 CORRESPONDENCE :	
Pope Liberius and Infallibility, by a Truth-seeker	50
Primitive Fathers on the Holy Eucharist, by Mr. John Duffy . .	51
On the Unanimous Consent of the Fathers, by J. R. D. B.	51
On Purgatory and the Fathers of the first three centuries . . .	52
What are the points of faith which the Roman Catholic Church requires to believe, and which are not in the Bible ? by Mr. Collette	53
Flowers for April	53
Farming Operations for April	53

THE VULGATE.

Two Hindoos are said to have disputed once about the meaning of a speech which the Queen of England had just addressed to Parliament, in which there was some important reference to Indian affairs. The one had derived his knowledge from a translation of the speech into Bengalee, the language spoken in the province of Bengal; while the other had read a Hindostanee version, which had been made from a Persian translation; the Persian language having been for a long time used in all government offices in India. The Bengalee version of the speech flatly contradicted the Hindostanee version; and each of the disputants stoutly maintained that *his* translation gave the true account of what the Queen had really said. The dispute might have been indefinitely prolonged, and would probably never have arrived at a satisfactory termination, were it not for the fortunate intervention of a third person, who happened to know English, and who had in his possession a copy of the *Times* newspaper, containing the speech itself. The production of this document to the two disputants at once settled the question, and restored harmony between them. The story verified the old adage, that "the stream is always clearer, the nearer the fountain head."

Now, if any of our Roman Catholic readers, who may be in possession of a Douay Bible, will open the title page, he will see that it is said to be translated from "the Latin Vulgate." It would be natural for him, when he reads these words, to feel some curiosity to know what is this Latin Vulgate, from which the Word of God, the message of the King of kings, has been translated into his own mother tongue. It may occur to him to ask, was Latin the original language in which the books of Scripture were written? But a very moderate amount of knowledge will show him that this could not have been the case. Moses, and David, and Isaiah did not write in Latin, but Hebrew—in truth, the Latin language scarcely existed in their time. Again, when we come to the New Testament, we find that St. Peter and St. Paul wrote in Greek, not in Latin; and, in fact, there is not a single book, of either the Old or New Testaments, that was originally written in the Latin tongue.

When these facts have been ascertained, the question still remains to be answered—Why was the Douay Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate? Our inquirer will naturally say, would there not have been less risk of mistakes and inaccuracies, if the translators had gone at once to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and the Greek text of the New. Why, he may ask, did they go to the Vulgate at all? What need was there of looking to a translation of what Isaiah or St. Paul wrote, when they had the original words of these inspired writers written in the language in which they thought and spoke? It would have been just as reasonable for the Hindoos of our story to have relied upon the accuracy of their Bengalee or Persian translations, when they might have read the Queen's own words in the English tongue.

Our readers might puzzle themselves for a long time in searching for the true cause of this seemingly strange anomaly, which we will now proceed to explain to them. Before doing so, however, we will first state, in a few words, what was the origin of the Latin Vulgate.

In the period which immediately succeeded the first preaching of Christianity, translations of the Scriptures were made into most of the languages which were spoken in the then civilized world. The Christian pastors and teachers were everywhere anxious that their flocks should be able to read and study the Word of God for themselves. No fears were then entertained, lest the people should make bad use of their knowledge. The early bishops and martyrs would, at once, have silenced all such doubts by our Blessed Lord's words (Matt. iv. 2)—“It is written, not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.” In those days, Latin was the language spoken at Rome, and throughout the greater part of the western world; and in the second and third centuries, there appear to have been, not one, but *several* Latin translations of the Scriptures in common use, derived, probably, from some one original version. Printing, of course, was unknown in these times, and each copy of a book had to be separately written out, in which process, if the transcriber was a careless man, several mistakes might arise. In this way many of the Latin versions had become so corrupt in the fourth century, that the eminent scholar, Jerome, was induced to make a new translation from the original Hebrew and Greek. Jerome's translation at first met with considerable opposition. He was pronounced a heretic, and accused of falsifying the Word of God. Gradually, however, the value of his version became recognised by eminent scholars who succeeded him; and towards the close of the seventh century, it was generally received in all the churches of the west, from which circumstance its name of Vulgate—i.e., the common or vulgar translation—was derived.

In this state matters stood for a long time, until at length, in the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent, among other matters, commenced to frame its decrees about the Holy Scriptures. The first question raised for discussion was, in what written document was the Word of God contained? This does not seem to be a question about which much difference of opinion ought reasonably to exist. A writer, whether inspired or not, commits his thoughts to paper. Is it in Hebrew? Then it is in Hebrew, and in Hebrew alone, that you are sure of having his thoughts, all his thoughts, nothing but his thoughts. Is it in Greek? Then it is in Greek that you will find what he meant. If you do not understand these tongues, nothing is more natural than that you should make use of a translation; but if you do understand them, why should you be prevented from going to the book as it came from the hands of the author? The only rational pretext for setting up a translation in place of the original work would be, by proving that the translation is of absolutely perfect accuracy. But if you have to do with an inspired book, the only ground on which we can reasonably assert that the translation is equal to the original, is to show that the translator is inspired as well as the original author.

And, accordingly, this was the view of the case taken by the most learned members of the Council of Trent. Louis de Catane* in particular, laid great stress on the well-known opinions of the eminent scholar, Cardinal Cajetan. This able writer was in the habit of saying, that to listen to the Latin text was not to hear the Word of God, which is infallible, but that of the translator, who was liable to error, and might deceive; he added, that Jerome himself, the author of the Vulgate, was in the right when he asserted, that to write the Books of Scripture needed the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; but to translate them into another language was a matter involving merely the exercise of ordinary talents. It was acknowledged, indeed, that if the Council of Trent were infallible certain that their deliberations were guided by the Holy Spirit, and if they themselves undertook the task of revising the Latin Bible, they might then order their translation, so made, to be an infallible authority in matters of faith, but that they had no right to pronounce such a decision about Jerome's Vulgate, of the accuracy of which they could not be sure.

But these reasons, however strongly urged, failed to

convince the understandings of the venerable men who composed the majority of the council. They had an innate horror and dread of Greek and Hebrew, and no wonder, for, perhaps, nine out of ten of them did not understand a line of either, but in Latin they were more at home; they felt somewhat like a sailor who is unwilling to trust himself to the perils of the wild ocean, when he has a safe anchorage at which he may ride securely. There was another cause which increased their antipathy to the two great original languages in which the Word of God had been composed. Many of the early reformers were eminent scholars, and used frequently to appeal to the Scriptures in their original tongues; and, as a matter of course, the venerable bishops of the council transferred a part of the hatred with which they were wont to regard the reformers, to the languages which the latter knew, but which, to themselves, were a dead letter.

An eminent historian* has given us the following sketch of a sermon, preached about the rise of the Reformation, which represents in a vivid light the horror with which the "new learning," as it was called, was regarded by the old-fashioned clergy of those days—"A new language," said a monk from the pulpit, "has been discovered, which is called the Greek. It must be carefully avoided; this language is the mother of all heresies. I see in the hands of many a book written in that tongue, it is called the New Testament; it is a book full of briars and vipers. As for Hebrew, those who learn it immediately become Jews."† These two tongues, *new*, because they were old, were looked upon as intruders; and venerable priests, grown grey in the recital of their missals and breviaries, asked indignantly what right Greek and Hebrew, forsooth, had to come and disturb the old familiar Latin, in the throne which it had so long occupied. Nay, even Cardinals themselves were not exempt from the prevailing prejudices; and in the year 1502, when the famous Bible of Alcalá was published, in which the Vulgate was printed between the Hebrew text and the Greek text, Cardinal Ximénès did not scruple to assert, that it was an exemplification of Christ between the two thieves.

The Council of Trent, therefore, eventually decided that the Latin Vulgate of Jerome—that very Vulgate which had gained the writer the imputation of heresy in his own day—should now be pronounced the true text of the Holy Scriptures, and that nobody, under any pretext, should dare or presume to reject it. “If,” said they, “we allow of a reference to the Greek or Hebrew text, we shall be kept in perpetual hot water. The grammarians will throw everything into universal confusion. They will then become the arbiters and judges of our faith; and bishoprics and cardinalships must be given to those pedants, to the exclusion of theologians and canonists. How can the inquisitors proceed against the Lutherans, unless they know Greek and Hebrew? These heretics will quickly say that the translation is wrong, and that the original text speaks in quite a different manner. Thus a door will be opened for the admission of every quirk and subtlety which a grammarian, either through malice or ignorance, may take it into his head to put forward and defend, by some rule of syntax, or other paltry evasion.”† In order, therefore, to prevent simple grammarians from giving the law to bishops and divines, the whole council—fathers, prelates, and archbishops—decided almost unanimously to approve the Vulgate version, as the *authentic* text of Sacred Scripture.§

Their conduct, it must be allowed, was natural enough, however indefensible on grounds of right reason, and unworthy of men professing to act under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit. However, having come to this decision, they seemed to feel that having erected the Vulgate,

* Sismondi. Hist. des Français, vol. xvi.

† We may remark, in connection with this subject, that we once met with a saying, current about the times of which we have been speaking, which exactly tallies with the discourse of the worthy monk given above—"To know Greek," it said, "is to know the language of the Jews; to know Hebrew, is a diabolical art." (The Greek, however, is: scire Hebraice, diabolicum.) We have lost the reference of the original authority.

‡ In the above account of the conference which was held in the Council of Trent on this subject, we have not, in the least degree, exaggerated the plain and rational statement of Eusebius and Serpi, who gives the names of those who spoke on the subject and the arguments which they employed. See his Hist. Eccl. lib. ii, sec. 51-53.

§ "Sacrosancta Synodus statuit, ut in hac typica vetus et Vulgata editio—pro authentica habeatur, et ut—quam emendatissime imprimatur."—Decret. S.S. Conc. Trid., Sess. iv.

* Vide Father Paul Sarpi. Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. II., sec. 51.

for the first time, to the pinnacle of perfection, as an authentic exposition of the mind of Holy Scripture, it would be not prudent, to say the least of it, to make every endeavour that it should be made as accurate as possible. The Council of Trent first approved of the Vulgate, as the authentic text of Scripture, and then decided that it should be corrected! Ordinary people may think, perhaps, that they ought to have reversed this order, that they should have corrected first, and approved after; but there is no accounting for tastes. We profess merely to give a faithful account of the course which the council did actually take on this question. Their conduct would have been more rigidly consistent, though certainly not a whit more reasonable, if they had denied the faults of the Vulgate, and proclaimed it at once infallible and perfect, than to declare it inviolable, even while confessing its faults, and that it was about to be corrected.

The task of correction went on but slowly. Towards the close of the Council, Pius IV. appointed a commission which made some little progress in the work. Pius V. renewed it and accelerated its labours. Gregory XIII., who succeeded him, appears to have thought the reformation of the calendar a business of more pressing importance than the reform of the translation of the Holy Scripture. Twelve years afterwards, Sixtus V. ascended the Papal throne, and found the work still incomplete. With characteristic energy he urged the matter forward, and, at length, at the beginning of 1589 (a quarter of a century after the close of the Council of Trent), the Pope announced, by a Bull that the work was drawing to a close. The new Vulgate was printed under his own eyes, at the Vatican, and the Pope himself revised the proofs. "We have corrected them with our own hands," he says in the preface (*nostra nos ipsi manu correctimus*). At length this wonderful work, the work of four Popes and five and twenty years, appeared in 1590. In the Papal Bull, which begins on the fourth page, the text of this edition is pronounced "the true, legitimate, authentic, and indubitable text;"* and all persons who should presume to alter it are threatened with "the indignation of Almighty God, and of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul."

A glance at the volume was enough to show the folly, not to say impiety, of such boastful presumption. "When the work appeared," says Hug, an eminent Roman Catholic writer, "it was impossible that it should not have given occasion for criticism and pleasantry. Many passages were found, particularly in the Old Testament, covered with slips of paper, on which new corrections had been printed; others were scratched out, or merely corrected with a pen. In fine, the copies issued were far from all presenting the same corrections."

It was clear, therefore, that the work should be done over again. Sixtus V. died; and the Romish theologians endeavoured to suppress the work entirely, and to substitute a new edition in its stead. Urban VII. lived only twelve days; Gregory XIV. made but little progress in it; Innocent IX., who reigned only two months, seems to have taken no part in it; and the completion of the work was reserved for Clement VIII., who published it in 1592. This new edition was also declared authentic, and accompanied with similar threats of excommunication against any who should presume to alter its text.

When these two editions—that of Sixtus V. and that of Clement VIII.—came to be compared, it was quickly found that there was the greatest diversity between them. Clauses were found in the one which were omitted in the other. They even contradict one another in various passages; and, in short, it was found that the two books differ in more than two thousand places!

Here was a nice difficulty for the advocates of Papal infallibility to solve! Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. had each declared that his edition was authentic and indubitable; and they had both denounced the heavy curse of Almighty God upon any one who should dare to assert the contrary.

But how, then, were the Romish divines to get over the awful, startling fact of the two thousand discrepancies? The most eminent divines were consulted. It was a difficulty which required all their cleverness and ingenuity to surmount—a real Gordian knot, which none but very sagacious casuists would ever dream of untying.

At last Cardinal Bellarmine took the matter in hand. If any one could defend the fortress of Papal infallibility, he was certainly the man to do it.

"Si Pergama dextra
Defendi possent etiam hæc defensus fuisset."

He is said by Hug to have owed his canonization as a saint to his publication on this question. And now the reader will ask how did Bellarmine get over the difficulty? By a very simple expedient. He proposed that all the blame should be laid upon the printer! Thus the honour of Pope Sixtus V. was saved: all the imperfections of his Vulgate were—errors of the press. Errors of the press! Surely nothing but the hardest necessity could ever have induced a writer of Bellarmine's great abilities to resort to an excuse so utterly weak and untenable. Did not Sixtus V. himself say, in the preface to his own Vulgate, "that he had corrected the sheets with his own hand?" The old and

new editions, moreover, differ in many places where there was no error of the press in the former. The latest historian of the Vulgate on the Continent does not hesitate to call the assertions of Bellarmine on this point "*lies and pious frauds*," a decision which, we regret to say, appears fully borne out by the plain facts of the case. How much more manly and straightforward would Bellarmine's conduct have been if he had frankly avowed that his task was hopeless, that there were differences between the Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates which no ingenuity could reconcile. But, alas! such an admission would have been a heavy blow to the Romish dogma of Papal infallibility—a dogma which Bellarmine was resolved to defend at all hazards and in the face of the most incontrovertible facts. By his preface to the Clementine Vulgate, Bellarmine may have succeeded in gaining the honour of canonization as a saint in the Church of Rome; but we fear that he thereby justly forfeited his character as an honest man and an impartial inquirer after truth.

We cannot avoid contrasting the conduct of the two Popes who issued these "*indubitable, authentic*," and yet contradictory editions of the Holy Scriptures to the world with that of the translators of the authorized version of the English Bible about twenty years later, in the year 1611. The latter make no boastful pretensions to infallibility; they utter no imprecations against their opponents; their own names are not once alluded to; they merely tell us that the great object of their labours was, "that out of the original sacred tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own and foreign languages, there should be one more exact translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue." The new translation was to be "more exact than its predecessors;" but perfect accuracy was, perhaps, unattainable, and to this they made no claim. However anxiously we may desire to possess a perfectly faithful version of the Word of God, yet we have reason to feel deeply thankful that our faith does not depend upon an absolute agreement in every particular between the original text and the translation into our own tongue. It has often been remarked, that of all the books in the world the Bible is, perhaps, less dependent than any other upon the skill of its translators, so far, at least, as regards its general tone and purport. While it calls for the exercise of the highest abilities and more than repays all the labour that can be expended on it, yet the great leading truths which it contains are such as cannot be obscured, even by the most careless version. A sinner who feels his need of salvation can learn, even from a very inaccurate translation of the Scriptures, that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7), and that "there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved"—Acts iv. 12.

We entreat those of our readers, who may have leisure and opportunity, to examine for themselves the facts we have cited above, and then to consider how far they are consistent with the boasted claims of the Church of Rome, either for herself or for the Pope, to be the sole, supreme, infallible judge, both of the letter and sense of Holy Scripture. We think we have said enough to show that the decision of the Council of Trent was contrary to reason and common sense; and as regards the rival Pontiffs, Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., who could not refrain from uttering curses while sending forth into the world the Scriptures of the God of Mercy and Love, we leave them to the real or pretended influence of their own rash denunciations.

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME, BETWEEN TWO ITALIAN GENTLEMEN.—No. IV.

Eustachio.—According to what you have said hitherto, it is clear that from the earliest times of the Christian Church the clergy, as well as the laity, had an undoubted right to marry. Now, if it be true that the long possession of anything secures enjoyment of it to the possessor, the Church of Rome cannot in reason forbid the marriage of her clergy.

Salviano.—Long possession is, sometimes, pleaded even in matters of religion. Why, the Church of Rome uses this very pretence, and says that our reformers have wronged her, whilst by their reformation they have tried to take away her purgatory, her masses, and many other things of which she boasts a long possession. This is not the place to enter into controversy about our reasons for having protested against such doctrines. I only ask you how (admitting the theory of long possession) Rome has taken away the right of marriage from the clergy, a right which they possessed for more than a thousand years? She may, perhaps, assert that this right was not well founded; but how can that be, when it was granted them by God himself, and when so many holy bishops and priests have taken advantage of it?

Eustachio.—But tell me, was there none who ever thought of once more permitting the clergy to marry? I think I have heard it said that many have urgently required this.

Salviano.—Ah! dear friend, it was soon perceived what would be the fruits of the new law of celibacy. St. Bernard says, "take away from the Church" (observe that Rome, by the word Church, means the clergy)

honourable matrimony, and it will be filled with keepers of concubines (Bernard, *serm.*, 66 in Cant.). In the 13th century, Bishop Durandus, in prescribing the method of reforming the Church, gave his advice, "that it would be useful, if, by a council, marriage should be granted to the priests, seeing that up to that time they were forced to chastity in vain; and that that might be easily brought about, inasmuch as the Greek Church still possessed this right, and that the Church in general acted upon it in the time of the apostles—De modo concilii celebrandi, art. 40. Æneas Sylvius himself says—"Perhaps, it would not be the worse that many priests should marry; many might be saved in conjugal priesthood who are destroyed in a barren presbytery" (In actis concilii Basil. lib. 2); and Baptista Platina explains the sentiments of this author in these words—"The clergy have been forbidden to marry for good reasons, but for better ones should this privilege be restored to them" (In vita Pii II., *vere in fine*).

Eustachio.—Truly, this was the speech of an honest man. What I wonder at is, that Æneas Sylvius, when he became Pope Pius II., never thought of abolishing the celibacy of the clergy. I think that he should have considered it his duty to restore to them that of which they had been unjustly deprived by others.

Salviano.—You are right, but you must consider that Æneas Sylvius and Pius II. are very different. It is one thing, in fact, to be a man, and another to be a Pope. Æneas Sylvius, as a man, did not speak *ex cathedra*, when he said that the right of marriage should justly be restored to the priests; but, as a pope, his own interests being changed, his mind was changed along with them. In fact, if he had corrected the error, by setting aside the ordinances of his predecessors, Papal infallibility would have fallen, on which Gregory the Seventh having built was desirous thus to enforce his law. Gregory exclaimed, "*I cannot err*;" and Pius, by abrogating his law, would have made it plain to all men that he did err, at the very time in which he asserted that he could not err. Æneas Sylvius, as Pope, did not wish that the clergy should marry, although, as a man, he himself had children without being married.* I might, also, adduce many other of your popes for whom it would have been much better if they had lived in the holy state of matrimony. Innocent VIII. was the father of four sons and four daughters. I need not say anything about Alexander VI., Sixtus IV., and very many others.

Eustachio.—I think I have heard it said, that even in the Council of Trent there was a request made that the right of marrying should be restored to the clergy.

Salviano.—Certainly, many distinguished persons pledged themselves to present to the Council of Trent a memorial to this effect. Charles, Duke of Austria, son of the Emperor Ferdinand I., and Albert, Duke of Bavaria, did all that was in their power to procure for the clergy once more the right of contracting marriage; and their ambassadors demanded it loudly in the council. The same was done by Henry II., and by Charles IX., kings of France, who took great pains to promote this object. The aforesaid Emperor Ferdinand I. made strong entreaties about it to the council; and even to his death considered that it was only just to grant marriage to the clergy. But all his endeavours having been vain, Maximilian I., by means of Count Prosper, made the same request of the pope. This monarch brought forth very weighty reasons to induce him to grant the marriage of the clergy; but these too were fruitless, and did not make the least impression upon the mind of the pontiff. The Council of Trent turned a deaf ear to these most just requests, as also to many others, made by a number of the princes, for the restitution of the cup, so that the holy supper should be administered to all with bread and wine, as it was ordained by Christ, and according to the custom of the Church for many ages. It was requested, likewise, that divine service should be celebrated in the churches in the vulgar tongue, so that it might be understood by the people, but all these remonstrances were useless.

Eustachio.—At other times, however, the popes were not ashamed to retract their errors; one pope abrogated the laws of another pope, one council corrected the decrees of another council; it seems, however, that the popes who directed the Council of Trent, by sending the Holy Spirit to it from Rome, would not yield one jot; in fact, in spite of all the protests that were made to them, and all the prayers and entreaties addressed to them by people of every degree, they could not be brought to decree that Rome should grant that to the clergy, which was granted to them by God.

Salviano.—I have told you that the popes are very different men from the first holy Bishops of Rome, and that in the councils men sat who were very different from those who took their seats in the holy Apostolic assemblies. The fathers of the Council of Trent imagined that they were infallible, and their watchword was "we will not yield; we will not give in to the Lutherans; if we yield in one point only, we shall prejudice all the others; if we yield one single title, how shall we maintain in future that the Church of Rome is infallible?" Could there have been asked of this council, anything more just than the restoration of the cup to the people in the Lord's supper? The authors

* His reply to his father, who reproved him for having had a child is so grossly indecent that I cannot bring myself to put it into English.—Translator.